

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This application is under final rejection. Applicant has presented arguments hereinbelow that Applicant believes should render the claims allowable. In the event, however, that the Examiner is not persuaded by Applicant's arguments, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner enter the amendment to clarify issues upon appeal.

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action dated July 25, 2005. Claims 1, 4-11, and 17-27 are pending. Claims 1, 4-11, and 17-27 are rejected. No claims have been amended, canceled, or added. Accordingly, claims 1, 4-11, and 17-27 remain pending in the present application.

Claims 1, 4-11, and 17-27 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Bindlish et al (5,608,864). In the section "Response to Arguments", the Examiner states:

...As per applicant's remarks on page 7, applicant argues "the format of data in the first pipeline of Bindlish is not transformed into the format of the data in the second pipeline" and further argues "no transformation from a first format to a second format occurs."

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Column 9 lines 30-45 of Bindlish recites "data from MVW FIFO 551 may be converted in serializer 552 to pixel data having a depth of eight bits per pixel" which clearly corresponds to applicant's claimed invention of "transforming data input without altering the application program".

Applicant respectfully disagrees. In accordance with the present invention, as recited in independent claims 1 and 17, the data inputs from the application program from the "first format in the first frame buffer" to the "second format in the second frame buffer".

Bindlish discloses a first data pipeline (CRF FIFO 530, Serializer 531, Mux 533, and DAC 536) and a second data pipeline (MVW FIFO 551, Serializer 552, Mux 537, and DAC 536), where data may be converted within the second data pipeline ("data from MVW FIFO 551 may be converted in serializer 552 to pixel data having a depth of eight bits per pixel"; col. 9, lines 30-45).

However, in contrast to the present invention, data from the first format in the first pipeline is not transformed to a second format in the second frame buffer. Bindlish instead discloses conversion within one pipeline/buffer rather than between two buffers.

Thus, Bindlish does not teach or suggest transforming data inputs from the application program from the first format in the first frame buffer to the second format in the second frame buffer for output on the output device, in combination with the other elements, as recited in amended independent claims 1 and 17.

Therefore, for the above identified reasons, the present invention as recited in independent claims 1 and 17 are neither taught nor suggested by Bindlish. Applicant further submits that claims 4-11 and 18-27 are also allowable because they depend on the above allowable base claims.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that claims 1, 4-11, and 17-27 are patentable over the cited reference. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the claims as now presented.

Applicants' attorney believes this application in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,
SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP

October 19, 2005
Date

/Michele Liu/ Reg. No. 44,875
Michele Liu
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 44,875
(650) 493-4540